



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,747	01/05/2001	Anthony J. Brookes	78104.017	3891

7590 10/09/2003

Intellectual Property Department
DEWITT ROSS & STEVENS, S.C.
Firstar Financial Centre
8000 Excelsior Drive, Suite 401
Madison, WI 53717-1914

EXAMINER

FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/755,747	Applicant(s) BROOKES, ANTHONY J.	
	Examiner Jeffrey Fredman	Art Unit 1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-18,20-31,33-44,46-52 and 67-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-18,20-31,33-44,46-52 and 67-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-31, 33-44, 46-52, and 67-76 are pending.

Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-31, 33-44, 46-52, and 67-76 are rejected.

The prior art rejections over Drobyshev and Wittwer are not applicable to the current claims, every single one of which require the presence of a monolayer of nucleic acid probes. There is no dispute that Drobyshev does not teach such a monolayer and clearly teaches away from monolayer detection. Therefore, since the rejections are moot as regarding the current claims, the arguments will not be addressed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-31, 33-44, 46-52, and 67-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As MPEP 2163.06 notes " If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - written description requirement. In re Rasmussen , 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981)."

The amendment to include the term "monolayer" is new matter. The specification of the instant application was wordsearched, both by an optical character recognition of the specification in the computer version of the application as well as by a word search

of the published application. The word "monolayer" as well as the broader term "layer" were both searched (including plurals) and no basis was found for these terms. The response confines itself to the bare statement that "no new matter has been added by the amendments or new claims (see page 14 of response)" but no specific support for the term "monolayer" is identified in the response. Therefore, in the absence of any identified support for the term, the claims are rejected as containing new matter.

Priority

2. The current claims do not receive priority to the parent application GB 9821989.2 as well as PCT/GB99/03329 because those specifications do not provide descriptive support for monolayers. Therefore, prior art as of the instant filing date is applicable to the current claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 8, 10-18, 21, 23-31, 34, 36-44, 47, 49-52, 67-71, 73, 74, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stimpson et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (1995) 92:6379-6383) in view of Wittwer (U.S. Patent 6,174,670).

Stimpson teaches a method of detecting DNA variation by monitoring the formation or dissociation of a of a complex (see abstract which states that "single base discrimination is facile") consisting of:

(a) a single strand of a DNA sequence (here the 15 mer oligonucleotide are attached to a glass solid support which is a monolayer of the nucleic acids, since each is directly attached to the glass support itself and not some three dimensional structure; see page 6380, column 1, for example),

(b) an oligonucleotide specific for the single stranded DNA sequence specific for one allele of the variation and capable of hybridizing to the single strand (a) to form a duplex (see the biotinylated complementary sequences, table 1 and page 6380-81, subheading "Hybridization and staining for wave guide")

(c) a marker detection of the duplex structure of (a) plus (b) which forms a complex with the said duplex (here the selenium label, see page 6381, figure 1, for example),

which method comprises:

- (1) continually measuring an output signal indicative of the duplex formed from the strand (a) and probe (b) (see page 6382, figure 3) and
- (2) recording the conditions at which a change in reaction output signal occurs which is attributable to formation or dissociation of the complex and is thereby correlated with the strength with which the probe (b) has hybridized to the single strand (a) (see page 6383, table 3, where the temperature at which the single base mismatch changes the signal).

Stimpson further teaches formation of two or more complexes, each with a probe specific for a different allele of the variation, and observing their respective denaturing

or annealing conditions to distinguish alleles of the variation (see page 6382, figure 3, where two oligos, 23B and 24B are simultaneously tested).

Stimpson does not teach the use of a marker which is duplex specific in the analysis.

Wittwer et al teaches a method of detecting DNA variation by monitoring the formation or dissociation of a complex (abstract) consisting of:

(a) a single strand of a DNA sequence (here denatured genomic DNA (column 9, line 21) and/or denatured amplified PCR products, including an 81 basepair cystic fibrosis gene product (column 40, lines 58-67)) as well as many longer PCR products such as the 536 base pair b-globin sequence (column 47, line 24),

(b) an oligonucleotide specific for the single stranded DNA sequence (here either the primers used in PCR (column 41, lines 1-20) or pairs of fluorescently labeled oligonucleotide probes (column 9, lines 27-37)),

(c) a marker specific for the duplex structure of (a) plus (b) which forms a complex with the said duplex and reacts uniquely when interacting within the duplex (here either SYBR green, (see column 40, line 65) or the fluorescence resonance energy transfer pair of labels, which differentially fluoresce when in duplex or single stranded states (column 9, lines 27-37)),

which method comprises:

(1) continually measuring an output signal indicative of interaction of the marker with duplex formed from the strand (a) and probe (b) (see column 9, lines 50-55 or column 41, lines 14-17 and figure 43) and

Art Unit: 1634

(2) recording the conditions at which a change in reaction output signal occurs which is attributable to formation or dissociation of the complex and is thereby correlated with the strength with which the probe (b) has hybridized to the single strand (a) (see page column 9, lines 55-59 or column 41, lines 14-17 and figure 43).

Column 14 details a similar assay for differentiating the Factor V Leiden mutation. Column 46 teaches the use of two or more complexes of the kind defined, each with a probe specific for a different allele of the mutation which multiple detection probes are distinguished by the different melting peaks (see column 46, lines 49-61). Wittwer further teaches measurement of the annealing based upon the first or second derivatives of the fluorescent melting curves (column 12 and columns 23-26) and expressly discusses measurement of the second order rate constant (see column 12).

Wittwer expressly teaches with regard to claims 67-70 that "The melting curves are easiest to visualize by plotting the negative derivative of fluorescence with respect to temperature vs temperature ($-dF/dT$ vs T) (column 45, lines 10-14)". Thus, with regard to the negative derivative of the fluorescent measurement, Wittwer is teaching determining the presence of a peak. Wittwer is clearly showing the presence of peaks in figure 46 B, where the homozygous and heterozygous (termed match and mismatch in the claim) are separately identified using the negative derivative data analysis method.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the markers of Wittwer in the mutation detection method of Stimpson since Wittwer states "SYBR™ Green I is a preferred double strand

Art Unit: 1634

specific dye for fluorescence monitoring of PCR, primarily because of superior sensitivity, arising from greater discrimination between double stranded and single stranded nucleic acid. SYBR™ Green I can be used in any amplification and is inexpensive. In addition, product specificity can be obtained by analysis of melting curves, as will be described momentarily (column 23, lines 9-16)". Thus, an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to use SYBR™ Green I in the melting curve analytical method of Stimpson since Wittwer teaches that this intercalator is superior in sensitivity, is useful in the particular assay employed by Stimpson since the waveguides would detect the fluorescent label and is inexpensive.

5. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-18, 20, 21, 23-31, 33, 34, 36-44, 46, 47, 49-52 and 67-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stimpson et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (1995) 92:6379-6383) in view of Wittwer (U.S. Patent 6,174,670) and further in view of Heller et al (U.S. Patent 6,048,690).

Stimpson in view of Wittwer teach the limitations of claims 1-5, 8, 10-18, 21, 23-31, 34, 36-44, 47, 49-52, 67-71, 73, 74, and 76 as discussed above. Stimpson in view of Wittwer do not teach immobilization of the oligonucleotide using biotin-streptavidin.

Heller teaches immobilization of oligonucleotides to arrays using biotin-streptavidin for nucleic acid detection assays (column 16, lines 62-67).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the method of Heller in the detection method of Stimpson in view of Wittwer since Heller states "In this example, the first probe (a capture/quencher probe sequence) has two terminal functional groups, a 5'-terminal

biotin group which allows the probe to be immobilized to the surface (permeation layer) of a microlocation test site on an active DNA chip or other hybridization device.”

(column 16, lines 62-67). An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to use the biotin capture method in order to permit immobilization of probes to desired microlocations of DNA chips for the analytical method. Also, an ordinary practitioner would be motivated to select a known equivalent of the method of Stimpson for attachment of the nucleic acids to the array as Stimpson teaches biotin capture methods (see page 6380, column 2).

6. Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21-32, 34-45, 47-52, 67-71, 73, 74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stimpson et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (1995) 92:6379-6383) in view of Wittwer (U.S. Patent 6,174,670) and further in view of Konrad et al (U.S. Patent 5,789,167).

Stimpson in view of Wittwer teach the limitations of claims 1-5, 8, 10-18, 21, 23-31, 34, 36-44, 47, 49-52, 67-71, 73, 74, and 76 as discussed above. Stimpson in view of Wittwer do not teach the use of Hepes buffer in hybridization.

Konrad teaches that “ The conditions for hybridization of oligonucleotide sequences are well known. Generally, the hybridization step is either performed in a buffered aqueous salt solution at high temperature or in the presence of formamide at lower temperature. The aqueous, high temperature procedure is typically carried out in a Tris buffer, such as 0.3M NaCl, 20 mM Tris -HCl, pH 6.8, at 67.degree. C. Other buffering systems such as hepes or glycine-NaOH and potassium phosphate buffers can be used. (column 14, lines 59-67)”.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the Hepes buffer of Konrad in the detection method of Stimpson in view of Wittwer since Konrad expressly teaches that Hepes buffer is an equivalent buffer for use in hybridization reactions.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1634

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is 703-308-6568. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 703-308-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1634